



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,208	07/24/2003	John Favazza	063170.6567(20000432)	9671
5073	7590	01/21/2009		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
			ART UNIT 2437	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 01/21/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com  
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/626,208

**Applicant(s)**

FAVAZZA ET AL.

**Examiner**

SHEWAYE GELAGAY

**Art Unit**

2437

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/3/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8 and 24-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-8 and 24-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***DETAILED ACTION***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/3/08 has been entered. New claims 37-38 are added. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 24-38 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-8 and 24-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML)", Netegrity, May 20, 2001, Pages 1-7 (hereinafter SAML) in view of Wood et al. (hereinafter Wood) US 6,892,307 and in view of Mishra et al. ("Security Services Markup Language", January 8, 2001 (hereinafter Mishra).

[Note: "XML Key Management Specification (XKMS)", W3C Note 30, March 2001, pages 28-45, is used to further elaborate on the teaching of XML signature and HMAC taught by Mishra reference]

As per claims 1, 7, 26 and 32:

SAML teaches a method comprising intercepting at an agent a web service customer access to a first web service, the agent residing between the web service customer and the first web service and between the web service customer and a second web service; (pages 5-6, SAML Overview; Authentication Authority.... A third party security service can provide authentication assertions for the end-user. Multiple destination web sites can then use the same authentication assertions to authenticate the end-user) collecting at the agent one or more credentials of the web service customer; (pages 5-6, SAML Overview; End-user submits credentials to Authentication Authority...the security service acts as a credentials collector, authentication authority, and attribute authority) determining at the agent whether the web service customer is authenticated and authorized; (pages 5-6, SAML Overview; Authentication Authority asserts user's credentials against user directory ) if the web service customer is authenticated and authorized, at the agent: granting the first request; initiating creation of a session and a session ticket; obtaining a session ticket ID for the session ticket; (page 5, SAML Overview; Authentication Authority generates an Assertion together with one or more attribute assertions. End-user is now authenticated and identified by SAML assertions assembled in a token... SAML assertions are encoded in common SML schema ...unique identifier used for the assertion name, date and time of issuance, and

the time interval for which the assertion is valid...authorization and key delegation applications) intercepting a second request to grant the web service customer access to the second web service, the second request comprising the assertion and a private key; (page 5, SAML Overview; the end-user's SAML token can be presented to trusted business partners affiliated in a single-sign-on relationship) and if the private key matches the public key in the assertion, grant the second request without reauthenticating or reauthorizing the web service customer (pages 5-6; Multiple destination web sites can use the same authentication assertion ... the security service acts as a credential collector, authentication authority, attribute authority and PDP).

SAML does not explicitly disclose intercepting a second request to grant the web service customer access to the second web service; encrypting the session ticket ID and a public key into an assertion and matching a private key with the public key in the assertion. Wood in analogous art, however, discloses intercepting at the agent a second request to grant the web service customer access to the second web service (col. 5, lines 19-24; col. 8, lines 23-67). Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by SAML with Woods in order to provide a single-sign-on for multiple information resources. (Abstract, Wood)

Both references do not explicitly disclose encrypting the session ticket ID and a public key into an assertion and matching a private key with the public key in the assertion. Mishra in analogues art, however, discloses encrypting the session ticket ID and a public key into an assertion and matching a private key with the public key in the

assertion. (page 11, 4. Architecture; ...assertions must be signed using the framework described in the [XML-SIG] specification...supports both using secret-key (for example, HMAC) and public-key signing; page 31 MIME Binding) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the method disclosed by SAML and Wood with Mishra in order to provide security services for assertions the may travel across the Internet and be scrutinized and checked for validity far from the point of origin. (page 11; Mishra)

As per claims 3, 8 and 27:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, SAML further discloses a method wherein the assertion comprises a Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML) assertion. (pages 5-6)

As per claims 5 and 28:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, SAML further discloses wherein the agent comprises an Extensible Markup Language (XML) agent. (page 6)

As per claims 6 and 29:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, SAML further discloses wherein the processor are further operable to determine whether the web service customer is authenticated and authorized comprises comparing the web service customer with a database containing authentication and authorization data. (pages 5-6)

As per claims 24 and 30:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, SAML further discloses wherein the first request and the second request both originate at the web service customer; and the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the web service customer to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. (pages 5-6)

As per claims 25, 31 and 35:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, SAML further discloses further discloses a method wherein the first request originates at the web service customer and the second request originates at the first web service; (pages 5-6) and the method further comprising communicating the assertion to the first web service to enable the web service customer to access the second web service without reauthentication or reauthorization after the web service customer accesses the first web service. (pages 5-6)

As per claim 33:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method comprising at the agent, placing the assertion into a header; sending the assertion to the first web service; returning the assertion to the web service consumer. (page 7, 3 S2ML Use Case Scenarios; assertions can travel with the user in various ways...http headers)

As per claim 34:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Mishra further discloses a method wherein the second request comprises an XML document containing the assertion; and wherein the web service customer has signed the XML document with the private key. (page 11, 4. Architecture)

As per claims 36-37

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Wood further discloses wherein the second request is intercepted at the agent before the second web service. (col. 5, lines 19-24; col. 8, lines 23-67)

3. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML)", Netegrity, May 20, 2001, Pages 1-7 (hereinafter SAML) in view of Wood et al. (hereinafter Wood) US 6,892,307 and in view of Mishra et al. "Security Services Markup Language", January 8, 2001 (hereinafter Mishra) and further in view of Moreh et al. (hereinafter Moreh) US 6,959,336.

As per claim 38:

The combination of SAML, Wood and Mishra teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. None of the references explicitly disclose determining at the agent whether the public key matches the private key. Moreh in analogous art, however, discloses determining at the agent whether the public key matches the private key. (col. 8, lines 22-col. 9, line 7) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the method disclosed by SAML and



Wood and Mishra with Moreh in order to provide a system to authenticate the owner of the assertion and verify the digital signature of the owner. (col. 8, lines 35-37; Moreh)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEWAYE GELAGAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. G./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437